

uliginosa, the fertile fronds of which do certainly very closely resemble those of *L. spinulosa*, but we do not think that there is, at present, sufficient evidence to show that it is really a connecting link between the latter plant and *L. cristata*.

From the plants that have been usually combined under the name of *Athyrium filix-fœmina*, the variety *convexum* of Newman is separated, and stands as a species under the name of *A. rhæticum*, Roth. We are inclined to admit this "split," on account of the constant dissimilarity of the plants. The *A. rhæticum* can hardly be confounded with any of the forms of the variable *A. filix-fœmina*. We are not satisfied that the correct name has been adopted for it, because there remain some doubts as to what plant was intended by Linnæus under the name of *Polypodium rhæticum*.

With these remarks we conclude, only adding that we can cordially recommend Mr. Moore's book.

Beiträge zur Mycologie. Von G. FRESENIUS, M.D. Frankfurt A. M. 1850, 1852. Hefte 1, 2. 4to, pp. 38. pl. 4, & pp. 80. pl. 5.

It has been objected against the German botanists of the present day, and not without good reason, that they work too frequently in almost utter ignorance of what is done by French and English botanists as regards the very subjects on which they are occupied. If this applies with any degree of justice to those who are engaged in the study of Phænogamous plants, much more so is the charge applicable to their Cryptogamists. Species which are in the hands of every one, and which have been long since described, are daily brought forward as new, and this frequently even where German authors have already published their observations. One lichenologist, for instance, coolly states his ignorance of the works of Hedwig and Dillenius, while others professedly have never consulted the large collections of Corda, and even in publications like Sturm's Deutschlands Flora, a work which bears a high character for general correctness, many species appear under new names which have long since been published, while representations of things entirely different are given for common species, such as *Peziza aurantia*.

Meanwhile it is most unfortunate as regards Mycology, that the copious collection of Rabenhorst, though containing many subjects of first-rate interest, is so little to be trusted in respect of nomenclature. Some very gross errors have been pointed out by the editor himself, who seems to depend very greatly upon others, not only for specimens, but for names, and we could ourselves furnish a list of some length. We believe that Klotzsch has had little or nothing to do with the work, since the completion of the second number.

If however a very glaring instance is wanted in confirmation of our remarks, we need but refer our readers to the work of Bonorden on Mycology, which, though containing some good figures amidst a good deal of trash, is full from one end to the other of the grossest blunders, not only as regards synonyms and nomenclature, but even in points of affinity, where the merest tyro might have come to a true judgement. It is therefore with some pleasure that we are able to

refer to the work whose title is placed at the head of this notice, as containing matter of a sterling character, and which gives promise of much that is sound and genuine. With all his faults, Corda has done a great deal for Mycology, and we should gladly see some one treading in the same footsteps as regards copiousness of illustration, for which a land singularly fertile in mycological productions is most favourable, but avoiding his looseness of synonyms and perplexity as regards everything like system and affinity. There was perhaps some little room for dissatisfaction in the first fasciculus of our author, but if there were just ground for this, we can speak with almost unmixed praise of the second part, which leaves but little to desire, either in point of illustration, or correct appreciation of the requisites of such a publication. As regards the illustrations, we can speak most favourably of their truth and correctness, while every possible pains have been taken to identify the new species with those which have been already published, both in this country and on the continent. We have noticed but one clear case of *double emploi* in the second fasciculus, viz. that of *Myxocyclus confluentis*, Riess, which is certainly identical with *Hendersonia polycystis*, Berk. & Br., in *Annals of Nat. Hist.* vol. v. p. 374, where the gelatinous envelope is even more perfectly described than by Fresenius. That this envelope is not of generic importance is proved by numberless instances in the sporidia of *Sphæria* and other genera. We would observe also, that it is impossible to establish genera in *Sphæriacæ* simply by the structure of the sporidia, otherwise species of undoubtedly close affinity will be very widely separated. We suspect that a comparison of specimens would be destructive to one or two more supposed new species, but without absolute inspection we are unwilling to throw out doubts which might prove groundless.

In the first fasciculus, if we mistake not, *Arthrobotrys oligospora* is nothing more than *Trichothecium roseum* correctly observed, *Septosporium nitens* is clearly *Macrosporium sarcinula*, Berk. *Ann. of Nat. Hist.* i. p. 261, and *Nemaspora persicina* is *Cytispora orbicularis*, l. c. p. 207, which more properly belongs to the genus *Glæosporium*.

Mistakes however are inevitable in so difficult a subject, even with the best materials and with access to the most perfect libraries, and there is so much really valuable in the work of Dr. Fresenius that it can well afford to have a few errors pointed out.

A Monograph of the Subclass Cirripedia, with figures of all the species. The Lepadidæ or Pedunculated Cirripedes. By CHARLES DARWIN, F.R.S., F.G.S.*

It is not without some shame that we confess, that we, who ought to be the heralds and indicators of all good work done in Natural History, should have allowed ourselves to be anticipated in justly appreciating the very high merits of Mr. Darwin's Monograph by a body, which we may venture to say, with all respect, is not usually complained of for the too great rapidity of its operations—the Royal

* Ray Society, 1851 (published end of 1852).